

Integrability of the diffusion pole in the diagrammatic description of noninteracting electrons in a random potential

V. Janiš

*Institute of Physics, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic,
Na Slovance 2, CZ-18221 Praha, Czech Republic **

(Dated: January 20, 2009)

We discuss restrictions on the existence of the diffusion pole in the translationally invariant diagrammatic treatment of disordered electron systems. We use the Bethe-Salpeter equations for the two-particle vertex in the electron-hole and the electron-electron scattering channels and derive for systems with time reversal symmetry a nonlinear integral equation the two-particle irreducible vertices from both channels must obey. We use this equation to test the existence of the diffusion pole in the two-particle vertex. We find that a singularity of the diffusion pole can exist only if it is integrable, that is only in the metallic phase in dimensions $d > 2$.

PACS numbers: 72.10.Bg, 72.15.Eb, 72.15.Qm

Introduction. Scattering of free charge carriers on impurities and lattice imperfections can lead at low-temperatures to a metal-semiconductor transition. There are two qualitatively different scenarios how a metal can turn insulating due to excessive scatterings on impurities. In the first case the metal-insulator transition materializes in substitutional alloys when charge carriers are expelled from the Fermi surface and an energy gap develops. This transition, called split band, is qualitatively well understood and quantitatively well modeled by a mean-field solution.^{1,2} The second type of a metal-insulator transition is much more complicated and up to now not completely understood. Electrons in a metal with random impurities can lose their ability to diffuse on macroscopic scales. Such scenario was first suggested by Anderson³ and is now called Anderson localization transition.

One of principle obstacles of full understanding of the Anderson localization transition is inability to describe vanishing of diffusion of electrons analytically even in its simplest model version and reconcile results from analytic and numerical approaches. Analytic, mostly diagrammatic and field-theoretic approaches in the thermodynamic limit indicate that the critical behavior at the Anderson localization transition fits the one-parameter scaling scheme with a single correlation length controlling the long-range fluctuations.^{4,5} On the other hand, an increasing number of numerical studies of the Anderson localization transition in finite volumes suggest that instead of homogeneous, translationally invariant parameters one has to take into consideration distributions of conductances or local particle densities.^{6,7} The two different methodological approaches, analytic and numerical, disagree not only on the number of relevant controlling parameters needed to understand Anderson localization but also on the critical behavior and the values of the critical exponents.^{8,9} Neither of these approaches is, however, absolutely conclusive in delivering ultimate answers.

In case of disagreement of results from two rather well established and otherwise reliable methods one has to revisit the assumptions under which either results were de-

rived and to which restrictions they are subject. One of the most important features used in the description of the critical behavior of the Anderson localization transition is a singular low-energy behavior of the density-density correlation function of disordered systems. This singularity has form of a resolvent of a diffusion equation and is called the diffusion pole. The existence of the diffusion pole and a connection of the diffusion constant with conductivity are consequences of conservation laws in random systems.¹⁰ Conservation laws should be a firm part of any reliable theory. We, however, showed recently that an asymptotic solution of the Anderson model of noninteracting electrons in high spatial dimensions does not fully obey conservation of probability.¹¹ We suggested a qualitative explanation for such an unexpected behavior but more importantly, we amassed arguments that unrestricted compliance with the conservation law is in random systems in conflict with analyticity of the spectral function.^{12,13} Since discussion about the form of the diffusion pole is still ongoing,^{14,15} we trace down in this paper the origin and set exact restrictions on the form of the diffusion pole derived within the translationally invariant description of disordered systems in the thermodynamic limit. We first thoroughly analyze the assumptions used to derive the diffusion pole and then prove an assertion about the acceptable form of this singularity without referring or resorting to any specific approximation. We find that in systems invariant with respect to time inversion the diffusion pole must be integrable in momentum space.

Definitions and assumptions. We model the system of non-interacting electrons by a lattice gas described by an Anderson Hamiltonian³

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \langle \mathbf{k}| + \sum_i |i\rangle V_i \langle i| \quad (1)$$

used to capture the impact of randomness on the electronic structure of metallic alloys as well as to understand vanishing of diffusion in the limit of strong randomness. The first, homogeneous, part of this Hamiltonian is kinetic energy and is diagonalized in momentum

space (Bloch waves). The second sum runs over lattice sites and describes a site-diagonal random potential. Values V_i at different positions are uncorrelated and follow a probability distribution $P(V_i)$. This term is diagonalized in the direct space by local Wannier states. The two operators do not commute, quantum fluctuations become important and the full Anderson Hamiltonian cannot be easily diagonalized. The only way to keep analytic control of the behavior of equilibrium states of the Anderson model is to go directly to the thermodynamic limit. Standardly it is approached by applying the ergodic theorem, that is, summation over lattice sites equals the configurational averaging. This means that we assume self-averaging property for all quantities of interest. This need not be, however, always fulfilled as we know from studies of Anderson localization. Presently we disregard this option from consideration as well as the problem of the existence of the thermodynamic limit.

Ergodicity itself, however, does not simplify the process of averaging over randomness. Another assumption must be adopted to master this problem. We assume that the thermodynamic limit can be performed independently term by term in the expansion in powers of the random potential. It means that we expect that the configurationally averaged perturbation expansion in the random potential converges for all quantities of interest.

Thermodynamic limit has an important simplifying consequence for macroscopic (averaged) quantities. The spectrum of a random Hamiltonian in the thermodynamic limit is invariant with respect to lattice translations. It means that operators $\hat{H}$ and $\hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}}\hat{H}\hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}}^\dagger$, where $\hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}}$ is the operator of translation with a lattice vector $\mathbf{R}$, have identical spectrum of eigenvalues with translationally shifted eigenvectors. A lattice translation by a vector $\mathbf{R}_n$ applied to the Anderson Hamiltonian from Eq. (1) generates a new one, $\sum_{\mathbf{k}} |\mathbf{k}\rangle \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) \langle \mathbf{k}| + \sum_i |i+n\rangle V_i \langle i+n|$ having the same distribution of random energies. Unless we break translational symmetry in thermodynamic states, we are unable to distinguish translationally shifted Hamiltonians. We cannot, however, break translational invariance of the thermodynamic states arbitrarily, since their symmetry should be in concord with the spatial distribution of the eigenstates of the Hamiltonian for the given configuration of the random potential. Since we do not know this spectrum, we must treat all lattice translations of the Hamiltonian as equivalent and instead of one Hamiltonian we are able to describe only the whole class of equivalent Hamiltonians $\hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}}\hat{H}\hat{T}_{\mathbf{R}}^\dagger$. In this way we cannot distinguish directly between extended and localized eigenstates of the random potential, since the localized states are represented by a class of vectors differing by lattice translations.

The natural basis for translationally invariant quantities is formed by Bloch waves labeled by quasimomenta. We generically denote $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q}$ fermionic and bosonic (transferred) momenta respectively. The fundamental building blocks of the translationally invariant description of disordered electrons are averaged one- and two-

particle resolvents $G(\mathbf{k}, z)$ and $G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{(2)}(z_+, z_-; \mathbf{q})$, where $z_+ = E + \omega + i\eta$ and $z_- = E - i\eta$ are complex energies with E standing for the Fermi energy, ω for the bosonic transfer frequency (energy), and η is a (infinitesimally) small damping (convergence) factor. We adopt the electron-hole representation for the two-particle Green function with $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{k}'$ for incoming and outgoing electron momenta. The bosonic momentum $\mathbf{q}$ measures the difference between the incoming momenta of the electron and the hole. Energies of the electron and the hole z_+, z_- in systems with noninteracting particles are external parameters.

The averaged one-electron resolvent in disordered systems can be represented as in many-body theories via an irreducible vertex – the self-energy $\Sigma(\mathbf{k}, z)$. We can write a Dyson equation for it

$$\left\langle \left\langle \mathbf{k} \left| \frac{1}{z\hat{1} - \hat{H}} \right| \mathbf{k}' \right\rangle \right\rangle_{av} = \frac{\delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')}{z - \epsilon(\mathbf{k}) - \Sigma(\mathbf{k}, z)}. \quad (2)$$

The self-energy $\Sigma(\mathbf{k}, z)$ stands for the impact of the scatterings of the electron on random impurities. Knowledge of the self-energy is then sufficient to determine the energy spectrum, spectral density and in general all aspects of propagation of single particles in disordered media.

The two-particle resolvent $G^{(2)}$ can then be represented via a two-particle vertex Γ defined from an equation

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{(2)}(z_+, z_-; \mathbf{q}) &= \left\langle \left\langle \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k} \left| \frac{1}{z_+ - \hat{H}} \otimes \frac{1}{z_- - \hat{H}} \right| \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}' \right\rangle \right\rangle_{av} \\ &\equiv \left\langle \left\langle \mathbf{k} \left| \frac{1}{z_+ - \hat{H}} \right| \mathbf{k}' \right\rangle \left\langle \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}' \left| \frac{1}{z_- - \hat{H}} \right| \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} \right\rangle \right\rangle_{av} \\ &= G(\mathbf{k}, z_+) G(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}, z_-) [\delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \\ &\quad + \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(z_+, z_-; \mathbf{q}) G(\mathbf{k}', z_+) G(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}', z_-)] \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $\otimes$ denotes the direct product of operators. The two-particle vertex introduces a disorder-induced correlation into the two-particle propagation. Analogously to the self-energy it measures the net impact of scatterings on impurities on the motion of particles in the presence of other particles.

The two-particle vertex Γ can further be simplified by introducing an irreducible vertex Λ playing the role of a two-particle self-energy. The irreducible and the full vertex are connected by a Bethe-Salpeter equation. Unlike the one-particle irreducibility, the two-particle irreducibility is ambiguous.¹⁷ There are two types of two-particle irreducibility in systems with elastic scatterings only, electron-hole and electron-electron. They are characterized by different Bethe-Salpeter equations. The Bethe-Salpeter equation in the electron-hole scattering

channel then reads

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) . \quad (4a)$$

We suppressed the frequency variables in Eq. (4a), since they are not dynamical ones. They can be easily deduced from the one-electron propagators $G_{\pm}(\mathbf{k}) = G^{R,A}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv G(\mathbf{k}, z_{\pm})$ used there.

We can introduce another nonequivalent representation of the two-particle vertex. If we sum explicitly multiple scatterings of two electrons (holes) we can construct an alternative Bethe-Salpeter equation¹⁷

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{ee}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}'') \times G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}'') \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'') . \quad (4b)$$

We introduced an irreducible vertex in the electron-electron scattering channel Λ^{ee} . Irreducible vertices Λ^{eh} and Λ^{ee} do not include isolated pair electron-hole and electron-electron scatterings, respectively.

Diffusion pole and electron-hole symmetry.

Noninteracting particles scattered on impurities are marked by a diffusion pole. The low-energy limit of a special matrix element of the two-particle resolvent, electron-hole correlation function, has the following asymptotics for $q \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega/q \rightarrow 0$

$$\Phi_E^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(E + \omega, E; \mathbf{q}) \doteq \frac{2\pi n_F}{-i\omega + D(\omega)q^2} + O(q^0, \omega^0) \quad (5)$$

where n_F is the density of one-particle states at the Fermi level.¹⁰ We used an abbreviation for the energy arguments $G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(E + \omega, E; \mathbf{q}) \equiv G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{(2)}(E + \omega + i0^+, E - i0^+; \mathbf{q})$. The low-energy electron-hole correlation function becomes a propagator of a diffusion equation.

Such a low-energy behavior is not evident and to prove it one has to use Ward identities connecting one- and two-particle averaged functions. Ward identities reflect conservation laws. In disordered noninteracting systems we have probability (mass or charge) conservation. It is mathematically equivalent to completeness of the Hilbert space of Bloch waves. First Ward identity due to charge conservation was derived for disordered systems within the mean-field approximation by Velický¹⁶ and later extended beyond this approximation in Ref. 17. It is a consequence of an operator identity

$$\frac{1}{z_+ - \widehat{H}} \frac{1}{z_- - \widehat{H}} = \frac{1}{z_- - z_+} \left[\frac{1}{z_+ - \widehat{H}} - \frac{1}{z_- - \widehat{H}} \right] \quad (6)$$

where the multiplication is the standard operator (matrix) one. This identity holds for any one-particle Hamiltonian. In the thermodynamic limit we must, however,

average this identity and the averaging procedure need not conserve all its aspects when projected onto translationally invariant states.¹² When using the above identity in the evaluation of the homogeneous part of the electron-hole correlation function, that is $q = 0$, we obtain

$$\Phi_E^{RA}(\mathbf{0}, \omega) \doteq \frac{2\pi n_F}{-i\omega} . \quad (7)$$

No spatial fluctuations ($q \neq 0$) of the correlation function in the low-frequency limit can be deduced from the Velický-Ward identity. To derive the spatial behavior of the diffusion pole in Eq. (5) one has to resort to another relation introduced by Vollhardt and Wölfle.¹⁸ It utilizes the Dyson and Bethe-Salpeter equations, Eq. (2) and Eq. (4a), and relates the one- and two-particle irreducible functions Σ and Λ^{eh} , respectively. It reads

$$\Sigma^R(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}, E + \omega) - \Sigma^A(\mathbf{k}, E) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}'} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(E + \omega, E; \mathbf{q}) \times [G^R(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}', E + \omega) - G^A(\mathbf{k}', E)] . \quad (8)$$

and was proved diagrammatically (perturbatively). Using the Bethe-Salpeter equation one can show that in the homogeneous limit $q = 0$ this identity reflects the continuity equation and hence is equivalent to the Velický-Ward identity. Equation (8) together with the Bethe-Salpeter equation are then used to show that the long-distance fluctuations of the low-energy limit of the correlation function are controlled by a diffusion constant. Introducing a dynamical diffusion constant $D(\omega)$ we can represent the full leading low-energy asymptotics of the electron-hole correlation function as in Eq. (5).¹⁰ Note that identity (7) holds for both pure and random systems, the actual diffusion pole, however, is only the singularity from Eq. (5) with the momentum dependence of the low-energy behavior. To prove such a spatially diffusive behavior the Bethe-Salpeter equation becomes an indispensable tool.

Another important feature of noninteracting electrons on a bipartite lattice without external magnetic field and spin-orbit coupling is the time reversal symmetry. Time inversion is equivalent to reversing the direction of the particle propagation, that is $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow -\mathbf{k}$. The electron and the hole interchange their roles. The time-reversal invariance for the one-particle propagator then means $G(\mathbf{k}, z) = G(-\mathbf{k}, z)$. Time inversion leads to nontrivial symmetries when applied onto one of the fermion propagators in two-particle functions. The electron-hole transformation can be represented either by reversing the electron line leading to a transformation $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow -\mathbf{k}', \mathbf{k}' \rightarrow -\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{q} \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}$ or by reversing the hole propagator $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow \mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}' \rightarrow \mathbf{k}', \mathbf{q} \rightarrow -\mathbf{Q}$ for the electron-hole function. Here we denoted $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'$. We then obtain two symmetry relations for the full two-particle vertex

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \Gamma_{-\mathbf{k}' - \mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{Q}) = \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(-\mathbf{Q}) . \quad (9a)$$

The two-particle irreducible vertices are not invariant with respect to time inversion, since the electron-hole vertex is transformed onto the electron-electron one and vice versa. We then have the following electron-hole symmetry relations

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) = \Lambda_{-\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{k}}^{eh}(\mathbf{Q}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(-\mathbf{Q}). \quad (9b)$$

This relation says that Bethe-Salpeter equation (4a) transforms upon time inversion in one particle line onto Bethe-Salpeter equation (4b). When the invariance with respect to the electron-hole transformation is applied to the correlation function we obtain

$$\Phi_E^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(E + \omega, E; -\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') . \quad (10)$$

This representation together with the Ward identity, Eq. (8), tell us that the same low-energy singularity for $\omega, \mathbf{q}^2 \rightarrow 0$ must emerge with the same weight in the averaged two-particle resolvent $G_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(E + \omega, E; \mathbf{q})$ also in the limit $\omega, (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{q})^2 \rightarrow 0$.

The uncorrelated propagation of electrons in a random potential does not contain the diffusion pole, and hence it must emerge in the vertex function Γ . Taking into account the time-reversal invariance we can single out the singular parts of the electron-hole symmetric two-particle vertex and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) &= \gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) + \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}}{-i\omega + D(\omega)\mathbf{q}^2} \\ &+ \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}}{-i\omega + D(\omega)(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}')^2} . \quad (11) \end{aligned}$$

The reduced vertex γ^{RA} has a marginal and thermodynamically irrelevant singularity for $\omega \rightarrow 0$ at $k = k' = q = 0$. It can, nevertheless, display another singular behavior in fermionic variables $\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}'$ that is not derivable from the diffusion pole. Such a singularity must not, however, affect the form of the diffusion pole in the electron-hole correlation function for $q \rightarrow 0$. The second term on the right-hand side of Eq. (11) dominates in the leading order of the limit $q \rightarrow 0, \omega \rightarrow 0$ while the third one in the limit $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' \rightarrow 0, \omega \rightarrow 0$. We used the dynamical form of the diffusion constant $D(\omega)$ so that the localization phase would fit. Equation (11) is the most general form of the two-particle vertex reproducing the diffusion pole in the correlation function Φ . The singularity for $\mathbf{q} \rightarrow 0$ is the diffusion pole while the other for $\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}' \rightarrow 0$ is the Cooper pole caused by multiple electron-electron scatterings. To conform this representation with Eq. (7) we have to satisfy a normalization condition that in the metallic phase ($D(0) > 0$) reads

$$\frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'} |G_+(\mathbf{k})|^2 \varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA} |G_+(\mathbf{k}')|^2 = 2\pi n_F . \quad (12)$$

Parquet equations with time-reversal symmetry. The full two-particle vertex symmetric with respect

to the electron-hole transformation can alternatively be decomposed by means of the so-called parquet equation that can be represented in various equivalent ways¹⁷

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) &= \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) \\ &= \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) + \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \\ &= \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) + \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q})$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q})$ are two-particle reducible vertices in the electron-hole and electron-electron channels, respectively. We denoted $\mathcal{I} = \Lambda^{eh} \cap \Lambda^{ee}$ a two-particle fully irreducible vertex, that is, a vertex irreducible simultaneously for both the electron-hole and the electron-electron pair propagation (multiple scatterings).

The parquet equations hold for the systems where the electron-hole and the electron-electron multiple scatterings are nonequivalent, that is, the corresponding two-particle irreducibilities are unambiguous and excluding definitions of diagrammatic contributions. The concept of the parquet theory based on nonequivalence of two-particle irreducibility can at best be understood in terms of sets of diagrams where addition of functions is represented by union of sets of diagrams the functions stand for. Nonequivalence of the electron-hole and the electron-electron multiple scatterings means $\mathcal{K}^{ee} \cap \mathcal{K}^{eh} = \emptyset$. We trivially have in each α -channel $\Lambda^\alpha \cap \mathcal{K}^\alpha = \emptyset$. Further on, we have $\Lambda^{eh} = \Lambda^{eh} \cap \Gamma = (\Lambda^{eh} \cap \Lambda^{ee}) \cup (\Lambda^{eh} \cap \mathcal{K}^{ee}) \subset \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{K}^{ee}$. On the other hand, $\mathcal{K}^{ee} = \mathcal{K}^{ee} \cap \Gamma = (\mathcal{K}^{ee} \cap \Lambda^{eh}) \cup (\mathcal{K}^{ee} \cap \mathcal{K}^{eh}) = \mathcal{K}^{ee} \cap \Lambda^{eh}$. Hence $\mathcal{K}^{ee} \subset \Lambda^{eh}$. Combining the above two relations we obtain $\Lambda^{eh} = \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{K}^{ee}$ from which we reach the parquet representations via irreducible or reducible vertices in Eq. (13), $\Lambda^{eh} \cup \Lambda^{ee} \setminus \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{K}^{ee} \cup \mathcal{K}^{eh} = \Gamma$.

One must be careful when using the parquet decomposition for noninteracting electrons with elastic scatterings only. In this case multiple scatterings on a single site are identical for both channels. Hence, the two Bethe-Salpeter equations (4) are identical, when the one-electron propagators are purely local. We then obtain $\Lambda^{eh} = \Lambda^{ee} = \mathcal{I}$. It means that irreducible and reducible local diagrams coincide and the concept of two-particle irreducibility becomes ambiguous. To amend this problem we introduce a stronger *full two-particle irreducibility* including also local scatterings where the electron and the hole are indistinguishable. We denote this vertex $\mathcal{J}$. The irreducible vertices $\mathcal{I}, \Lambda^{eh}$ and Λ^{ee} for noninteracting electrons are then transformed in parquet equations (13) to

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{\mathcal{J}^0 G_+ G_-}{1 - \mathcal{J}^0 G_+ G_-} \mathcal{J}^0 , \quad (14a)$$

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^\alpha(\mathbf{q}) = \bar{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^\alpha(\mathbf{q}) + \frac{\mathcal{J}^0 G_+ G_-}{1 - \mathcal{J}^0 G_+ G_-} \mathcal{J}^0 \quad (14b)$$

where $\mathcal{J}^0 = N^{-3} \sum_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'\mathbf{q}} \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ and $G_\pm = N^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} G_\pm(\mathbf{k})$ are the appropriate local (momentum-independent) parts. Vertex $\bar{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^\alpha(\mathbf{q})$ is irreducible in channel α but does not contain multiple scatterings on

the same site. It is important that the fully irreducible vertex $\mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ contains only cumulant averaged powers of the random potential on the same lattice site so that double counting is avoided.

We now use the symmetries from Eq. (9) to replace the two irreducible vertices by a single function. We define

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \equiv \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') . \quad (15)$$

We use this definition in parquet equation (13) where we represent the full vertex by Bethe-Salpeter equation (4a). We then obtain a fundamental equation for the irreducible vertex

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) &= \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'') G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \\ &\times [\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) + \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}'' - \mathbf{k}') - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})] . \quad (16) \end{aligned}$$

This is a nonlinear integral equation for vertex Λ from an input $\mathcal{I}$ that may have multiple solutions. We choose the physical one by matching it to a perturbative solution reached by an iterative procedure with an auxiliary coupling constant λ and a starting condition $\Lambda^{(0)} = \lambda \mathcal{I}$. The iteration procedure for a fixed coupling constant λ is determined by a recursion formula

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \left[\delta_{\mathbf{k}'', \mathbf{k}'} - \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{(n-1)}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'') G_+(\mathbf{k}'') \right. \\ \left. \times G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \right] \left(\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}^{(n)}(\mathbf{q}) - \lambda \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \right) \\ = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{(n-1)}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'') G_+(\mathbf{k}'') \\ \times G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}^{(n-1)}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k}'' - \mathbf{k}') . \quad (17) \end{aligned}$$

In this way vertex $\Lambda = \Lambda^{(\infty)}$ is completely determined from the input, the fully irreducible vertex $\lambda \mathcal{I}$. A physical solution for $\lambda = 1$ is reached only if the iteration procedure converges for $0 < \lambda \ll 1$ and the result can analytically be continued to $\lambda = 1$. This construction of the physical solution corresponds to the linked-cluster expansion from many-particle physics.¹⁹ The iteration scheme from Eq. (17) is the only available way to reach a physical solution and hence its convergence and analyticity are of principal importance for the diagrammatic description of disordered systems. Using Eqs. (14) we can rewrite the above equation to another one for the irreducible vertex $\bar{\Lambda}$ determined from $\mathcal{J}$. The latter vertex is the genuine independent input. Notice that in single-site theories with local one-electron propagators we obtain a solution $\bar{\Lambda} = \mathcal{J}^0$ to Eq.(17).

Equation (16) (alternatively Eq. (17)) is a fundamental equation of motion for the two-particle irreducible vertex being electron-hole symmetric. The corresponding full two-particle vertex obeys simultaneously both

the Bethe-Salpeter equations in the electron-hole and the electron-electron channels, Eqs. (4) and the two equations are not identical, that is $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q}) \neq \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q})$. Non-linearity of the fundamental equation for the irreducible vertex poses restrictions on the admissible form of the singular behavior in its solutions. Singularities in the full vertex Γ emerge only via singularities in the irreducible vertex Λ .

Assertion. *Two-particle vertex Γ of noninteracting electrons in a random potential can be decomposed into irreducible vertices as*

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) + \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(-\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) , \quad (18)$$

if electrons and holes are distinguishable (non-equivalent) quasiparticles and the system is invariant with respect to time inversion (electron-hole symmetric). We denoted $\mathcal{I}$ the two-particle fully irreducible vertex. Irreducible vertex Λ obeys Eq. (16). The diffusion pole in the full two-particle vertex Γ may materialize only if it appears in the irreducible vertex Λ . Consequently, the diffusion and Cooper poles from Eq. (11) can exist in Γ only in the metallic phase in spatial dimensions $d > 2$.

Proof. Equation (18) is a direct consequence of parquet equation (13) where the electron-hole symmetry, Eq. (9), is used. The parquet equation holds if the electron and the hole are distinguishable quasiparticles via their multiple mutual scatterings. That is, electron-electron and electron-hole scatterings do not lead to identical results.

We need not find the most general form of low-energy ($\omega \rightarrow 0$) singularities compliant with Eq. (16) but rather check whether and when singularities from representation (11) can emerge in solutions of Eq. (16).

Vertex $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ contains the diffusion pole of the full vertex Γ , $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q})$ the Cooper pole and the fully irreducible vertex $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ is free of these poles. This conclusion follows from an alternative form of Eq. (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) &= \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}) G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \\ &- \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} [\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q})] \\ &\times G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

where we used the fundamental parquet equation (13) to represent the integral kernel Λ . The electron-hole symmetry leads in the limit $q \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$ to an equation for the complex conjugate of the full two-particle vertex

$$\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)^* = \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}'+\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{k}+\mathbf{q}}^{RA}(-\mathbf{q}, -\omega) \quad (20)$$

that we use to evaluate the convolution of the diffusion poles from the full vertex Γ in the first sum on the right-hand side of Eq. (19). We obtain for $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{k}'$ in the leading

order of $q \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'') \Gamma_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) |$$

$$\xrightarrow{q \rightarrow 0, \omega \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \frac{|\varphi_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}}^{RA} G_+(\mathbf{k}'')|^2}{\omega^2 + D(\omega)^2 q^4}.$$

This squared diffusion pole must be compensated by the second sum on the right-hand side of Eq. (19). It means that the diffusion pole must be completely contained in function $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{eh}(\mathbf{q})$. From the electron-hole symmetry we then obtain that the Cooper pole must completely be contained in function $\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{ee}(\mathbf{q})$ and consequently the sum of the diffusion and the Cooper poles from the full vertex $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ in Eq. (11) is already part of function $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q}) - \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$. The fully irreducible vertex $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ is hence free of the diffusion and Cooper poles.

We discuss first the behavior of the diffusion pole in the metallic phase with $D(0) = D > 0$. When inserting the singular part of the two-particle vertex due to the diffusion pole we obtain the leading singularity on the left-hand side of Eq. (17)

$$S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^L(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = - \frac{1}{-i\omega + Dq^2}$$

$$\times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{RA} \varphi_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}^{RA} G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'')}{-i\omega + D(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'')^2} \quad (21a)$$

and on its right-hand side

$$S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^R(\mathbf{q}, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{RA} \varphi_{\mathbf{k}''\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}}{-i\omega + D(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'')^2}$$

$$\times \frac{G_+(\mathbf{k}'') G_-(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}'')}{-i\omega + D(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}' + \mathbf{k}'')^2}. \quad (21b)$$

Since the singular term from Eq. (21a) contains the complete form of the diffusion pole, the sum over momenta must not bring any new singular contribution in small frequencies and is of order $O(\omega^0)$. To assess the low-frequency behavior ($\omega \rightarrow 0$) of the sum over momenta we equal external fermionic momenta $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{k}$ and use an asymptotic representation for the contribution from the singular part of the integrands

$$S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^L(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \doteq \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}}^{RA} \varphi_{-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{RA} G^R(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}) G^A(\mathbf{k})}{-i\omega + Dq^2}$$

$$\times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''}^{\kappa} \frac{1}{-i\omega + D(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'')^2}, \quad (22a)$$

$$S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \doteq \varphi_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}}^{RA} \varphi_{-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{k}}^{RA} G^R(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k}) G^A(\mathbf{k})$$

$$\times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''}^{\kappa} \frac{1}{[-i\omega + D(\mathbf{q} + \mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'')^2]^2}, \quad (22b)$$

where κ is an appropriate momentum cut-off. The two expressions cannot be more divergent in the low-

frequency limit as $(-i\omega)^{-1}$ for any value of the external momenta $\mathbf{q}$ and $\mathbf{k}$. Due to the normalization condition, Eq. (12), we find to each vector $\mathbf{k}$ a set (of measure one) of momenta $\mathbf{q}$ so that $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}}^{RA} \neq 0$. If the homogeneous case, $q = 0$, falls into this set then from Eq. (22a) we obtain integrability of the diffusion pole. If not, then for $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}, -\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{k}}^{RA} \neq 0$ we obtain $S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^L(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \propto (-i\omega)^{d/2-1}/(-i\omega + Dq^2)$ and $S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \propto (-i\omega)^{d/2-2}$. For low dimensions $d \leq 2$, both functions $S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^L(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ and $S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ have a stronger divergence than $(-i\omega)^{-1}$ (for $q = 0$) and Eq. (17) cannot be satisfied by any function $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. The diffusion pole can hence exist in the metallic phase only in dimensions $d > 2$.

In the localized phase we expect the following low-energy asymptotics ($q \rightarrow 0, \omega \rightarrow 0$) of the dynamical diffusion constant²⁰

$$\xi^2 = \frac{D(\omega)}{-i\omega} > 0 \quad (23)$$

where ξ is a localization length. Using this asymptotics we can represent the singular part of the irreducible vertex Λ as follows

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{sing}(\mathbf{q}, \omega) \doteq \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{sing}}{-i\omega} \frac{1}{1 + \xi^2 \mathbf{q}^2}. \quad (24)$$

We utilize the electron-hole symmetry to evaluate the complex conjugate of the irreducible vertex Λ in the low-frequency $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and momentum $q \rightarrow 0$ limit

$$\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)^* = \Lambda_{-\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{q}, -\mathbf{k}'-\mathbf{q}}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, -\omega) \quad (25)$$

and use it to derive a condition for vanishing of quadratic singularity of order ω^{-2} on the right-hand side of Eq. (16). After substituting the representation of vertex Λ from Eq. (24) and setting $\mathbf{k}' = \mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{q} = 0$ in Eq. (16) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{k}''} \left| \frac{\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{RA} G_+(\mathbf{k}'')}{1 + \xi^2 (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'')^2} \right|^2 [2 + \xi^2 (\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}'')^2] = 0. \quad (26)$$

This condition can be fulfilled only if the irreducible vertex $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ is free of the singularity due to the diffusion pole for $q \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega \rightarrow 0$, that is, $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}''}^{RA} = 0$ point-wise. The diffusion pole hence cannot exist in the localized phase.

Discussion and conclusions. The most severe consequence of the Assertion is nonexistence of the diffusion pole in the localized phase in any dimension. It means that when approaching the low-energy limit $q \rightarrow 0$ and $\omega/q \rightarrow 0$ in low dimensions ($d \leq 2$) we cannot meet the diffusion-pole singularity. The localized phase must be reached in a non-critical or a less critical manner than that of the diffusion pole. Theories, such as the self-consistent theory of Anderson localization of Vollhardt and Wölfle,²⁰ leading to solutions with a nonintegrable diffusion pole are in conflict with the Bethe-Salpeter equation either in the electron-hole or in the electron-electron channel or with the electron-hole symmetry at the two-particle level.

The Assertion poses no restriction on the expected form of the diffusion pole in the metallic phase in dimensions $d > 2$, since the singularity is integrable. The localized phase in $d > 2$ is, however, different. There the widely accepted behavior of the diffusion pole, due to vanishing of the diffusion constant ($D = 0$), becomes momentum independent and hence nonintegrable. The fundamental equation (16) for the irreducible vertex Λ cannot lead to a two-particle vertex with such a singularity. If the diffusion pole in $d > 2$ survives in the metallic phase unchanged till the Anderson metal-insulator transition, there must be a jump at the transition point at which the diffusion pole abruptly ceases to exist.

Numerical simulations nevertheless seem to confirm the existence of the diffusion pole in the localized phase.¹⁵ There are two possible conclusions we can draw from these incommensurable results. One can speculate that some of the assumptions on which the diagrammatic translationally invariant description of random systems is based do not hold near to the Anderson localization transition. Either ergodicity may be broken or one cannot average the expansion in the random potential term by term, or the concept of distinguishability of the electron-electron and electron-hole scatterings is invalid. If this was true, then one had either to revisit the derivation of the diffusion pole, being presently heavily based on the Bethe-Salpeter representation of the two-particle vertex, or to question the concept of electrons and holes as distinguishable quasiparticles in the localized phase.

On the other hand, numerical simulations are performable only on rather small lattices where one cannot effectively reach the diffusive regime $q \rightarrow 0$ with $\omega/q \rightarrow 0$. Ref. 15 investigates the opposite limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$ with $q/\omega \rightarrow 0$. As we know,¹⁰ the two limits do not commute and the latter has no relevance for the existence of the diffusion pole. The numerically observed $1/\omega$ behavior reflects only the Velický identity (7) valid for random as well as pure systems. A conflict between the form of the diffusion pole and the Bethe-Salpeter equation arises only in the critical region of the latter. Ward identity (7) cannot be extended to inhomogeneous long-range fluctuations and the homogeneous low-frequency limit $\omega \rightarrow 0$ with $q = 0$ may be a singular point having no macroscopic relevance for nonzero spatial fluctuations $q > 0$ in the thermodynamic limit.

Last but not least, we obtain as a consequence of Eq. (16) that the two-particle vertex $\Gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}(\mathbf{q})$ in the

metallic phase of the most interesting spatial dimensions $2 < d < 4$ contains apart from the diffusion and the Cooper pole also another low-energy singularity for $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and $|\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'| \rightarrow 0$. We found that $S_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}}^R(\mathbf{0}, \omega) \doteq (-i\omega)^{d/2-2}$ in $d < 4$ and hence a new singularity in vertex $\Lambda_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ emerges for $\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}' \rightarrow 0$. Due to the normalization condition, Eq. (12), it must be integrable, which is the case for $d > 2$. This new singularity is compatible with the decomposition from Eq. (11) of the two-particle vertex Γ into singularities caused by the diffusion pole. The existence of a new singularity makes either the weight of the diffusion pole $\varphi_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}$ or $\gamma_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}^{RA}(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$ or both singular with an integrable singularity. A new singularity in the two-particle vertex indicates that the averaged two-particle functions in spatial dimensions $2 < d < 4$ behave qualitatively differently and have a richer analytic structure from those in higher dimensions. How far this singularity influences the macroscopic behavior and transport properties of disordered systems and in particular criticality of the Anderson localization transition remains to be investigated.

To conclude, we proved in this paper that the diffusion pole in the two-particle vertex can exist in the models of noninteracting electrons in a random potential with time reversal symmetry only in the metallic phase in dimensions $d > 2$. An equation of motion for the two-particle irreducible vertices prevents the existence of the diffusion pole in the localized phase. The existing translationally invariant descriptions of electrons in a random potential predicting the existence of a pole in the localized phase should hence be revisited. In view of our result, it seems very difficult, if not impossible, to build up a consistent analytic theory of Anderson localization with the diffusion pole in the localized phase.

Acknowledgments. Research on this problem was carried out within project AVOZ10100520 of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic and supported in part by Grant No. 202/07/0644 of the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic. I acknowledge a fruitful collaboration and extensive discussions with J. Kolorenč on the problem of Anderson localization. I profited a lot particularly from his critical remarks. I thank the Isaac Newton Institute for Mathematical Sciences in Cambridge (UK) for hospitality extended to me during my participation in the Programme *Mathematics and Physics of Anderson Localization*.

* Electronic address: janis@fzu.cz

¹ R. J. Elliot, J. A. Krumhansl, and P. L. Leath, Rev. Mod. Phys. **46**, 465 (1974).

² A. Gonis, *Green Functions for Ordered and Disordered Systems* (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1992).

³ P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. **109**, 1492 (1958).

⁴ F. J. Wegner, Z. Physik **B35**, 327 (1976).

⁵ E. Abrahams, P. W. Anderson, D. C. Licciardello, and T.

V. Ramakrishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **42**, 673 (1979).

⁶ B. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 1510 (1990).

⁷ P. Markoš and B. Kramer, Phil. Mag. **B68**, 357 (1993).

⁸ B. Kramer and A. MacKinnon, Rep. Phys. **56**, 1469 (1993).

⁹ P. A. Lee and R.V. Ramakrishnan, Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 287 (1985).

¹⁰ V. Janiš, J. Kolorenč, and V. Špička, Eur. Phys. J. **B35**, 77 (2003).

- ¹¹ V. Janiš and J. Kolorenč, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 033103, 245106 (2005).
- ¹² V. Janiš and J. Kolorenč, Phys. Stat. Sol. (b) **241**, 2032 (2004).
- ¹³ V. Janiš and J. Kolorenč, Mod. Phys. Lett. B **18**, 1051 (2004).
- ¹⁴ I. M. Suslov, preprint arXiv:cond-mat/0612654.
- ¹⁵ J. Brndiar and P. Markoš, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 115131 (2008).
- ¹⁶ B. Velický, Phys. Rev. **184**, 614 (1969).
- ¹⁷ V. Janiš, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 115115 (2001).
- ¹⁸ D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 842 (1980).
- ¹⁹ G. D. Mahan, *Many-Particle Physics*, Second Edition (Plenum Press, New York 1990).
- ²⁰ D. Vollhardt and P. Wölfle, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 4666 (1980) and in *Electronic Phase Transitions*, edited by W. Hanke and Yu. V. Kopayev, (Elsevier Science Publishers B. V., Amsterdam, 1992).